

1
2
3
4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 ROSEMARY N. CHUKWUDEBE, No. C-13-5466 EMC
9 Plaintiff,

10 v. **ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE; AND**
11 PONGRI LU, *et al.*, **VACATING HEARING**
12 Defendants.

Plaintiff Rosemary N. Chukwudebe has filed suit against twenty-four different defendants, including but not limited to the following defendants: AOE Law & Associates, Inc.; Anthony O. Egbase; Onyinye Anyama; Chike Emenike; Victoria Orafa; Allan Wilcox; Keren Reyes; Marilyne Medawar; and Joanne Sanchez (collectively, “AOE Defendants”). The AOE Defendants appear to be the law firm that formerly represented her and its employees. They have filed a motion asking for dismissal of all claims asserted against them. Ms. Chukwudebe failed to file a response to the motion to dismiss.

22 Accordingly, the Court hereby orders Ms. Chukwudebe to show cause as to why all claims
23 against the AOE Defendants should not be dismissed with prejudice. Ms. Chukwudebe's response
24 must address the arguments raised in the AOE Defendants' motion. Ms. Chukwudebe is forewarned
25 that, if she fails to file a response to this order to show cause by **March 13, 2014**, then all claims
26 against the AOE Defendants shall automatically be dismissed with prejudice. The Court also
27 advises Ms. Chukwudebe that this order does not relieve her of an obligation to file an amended
28 complaint with respect to her claims against Wells Fargo, consistent with the Court's order of

1 January 6, 2014. *See* Docket No. 12 (Order at 7) (giving Ms. Chukwudebe until **March 13, 2014**, to
2 file an amended complaint with respect to her claims against Wells Fargo or her claims against
3 Wells Fargo will be dismissed *with* prejudice).

4 The April 3, 2014, hearing on the AOE Defendants' motion is hereby **VACATED**.

5 This order disposes of Docket No. 6.

6

7 IT SO ORDERED.

8

9 Dated: February 19, 2014

10
11 
EDWARD M. CHEN
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28